



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/647,642	08/25/2003	David Ernest Hartley	PA-5343-RFB	2511
9896	7590	08/17/2005		
COOK GROUP PATENT OFFICE P.O. BOX 2269 BLOOMINGTON, IN 47402			EXAMINER PRONE, CHRISTOPHER D	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			3738	

DATE MAILED: 08/17/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/647,642

Applicant(s)

HARTLEY, DAVID ERNEST

Examiner

Christopher D. Prone

Art Unit

3738

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 31 May 2005.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-19, 22 and 23 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-5, 7-13, 15-19, 22 and 23 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) 6 and 14 is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 5/31/05
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Election/Restrictions

Applicant's election without traverse of Invention 1 and species 1 in the reply filed on 5/31/05 is acknowledged.

Information Disclosure Statement

The information disclosure statement filed 5/31/05 fails to comply with 37 CFR 1.98(a)(2), which requires a legible copy of each cited foreign patent document; each non-patent literature publication or that portion which caused it to be listed; and all other information or that portion which caused it to be listed. It has been placed in the application file, but the information referred to therein has not been considered.

In regards to cited reference (AG) USPN 5741235, Cheikof et al is not the inventor. The examiner believes that this is the incorrect patent number.

Claim Objections

Claims 1, 9 and 22 are objected to because of the following informalities: grammatical error. Line 8 of claim 1 recites "retention points then other of the points," which is unclear. "The" should be inserted in line 8 after the word "then" for further clarity. Similar problems occur in line 10 of claims 9 and 22.

Claim 7 objected to because of the following informalities: improper dependency. Claim 7 is dependant upon claim 4, but it is believed that the

Art Unit: 3738

applicant intended for this claim to be dependant upon claim 5 because of the reference to the trigger wires.

Claim 18 objected to because of the following informalities: improper dependency. Claim 18 is dependant upon claim 16, but it is believed that the applicant intended for this claim to be dependant upon claim 17 because of the reference to the zigzag Z stents.

Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter, which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claims 2, 10, and 19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Regarding claims 2 and 10, the recitation that the retention arrangement includes at least two points is considered to make the claims indefinite, since the resulting claims do not meet the requirements of independent claim 1 which they are dependant upon. In Independent claim 1 on lines 7-9 and independent claim 9 on lines 9-10 3 points are defined. Therefore it is not possible for the release mechanism to have only two fastening points as recited in claims 2 and 10.

Regarding claim 19, the phrase "such as" renders the claim indefinite because it is unclear whether the limitations following the phrase are part of the claimed invention. See MPEP § 2173.05(d).

Art Unit: 3738

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) The invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claims 1-4, 9-12, 17-19, 22, and 23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by United States Patent 5,873,906 Lau et al.

In regards to claims 1-4, 9-12, 17, 19, 22, and 23, Lau discloses the same invention being a self-expanding zigzag shaped stent graft mounted on a deployment device shown in figures 19A-22. Lau discloses that his stent is mounted on a guidewire catheter (304), which is contained by a trigger wire catheter (306) having a proximal end that is held in place by a retention device about a plurality of points shown best in figure 22. The retention device forms 3 lobes. There are two small upper lobes formed by upper retention points (324) and (326) and one large lower lobe shown in figure 22 and again in the figure below for more clarity.

In regards to claim 18, Lau discloses the use of wires or polymeric thread (324) and (326) tied to the stent structure and the trigger wires for retention of the stent to the catheter (18:27-31)

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 5, 7, 8, 13, 15, and 16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103 as being unpatentable over United States Patent 5,873,906 Lau et al in view of United States Patent 4,913,141 Hillstead.

Lau discloses the invention substantially as claimed being a stent graft coupled to a deployment device through trigger wires that engage suture loops, which remain on the stent after deployment. However, Lau does not disclose that the trigger wires exit the catheter through separate apertures at the retention points.

However Lau describes the engagement used by Hillstead. Hillstead teaches the use of a stent and a delivery system wherein the trigger wire is directed through a small aperture just prior to the engagement with the stent in the same field of endeavor for the purpose of providing a smooth path for the trigger wire.

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the apertures taught by Hillstead with

Art Unit: 3738

the deployment device of Lau in order to keep the trigger wires untangled and separate from each other allowing a smoother release of the stent.

Allowable Subject Matter

Claims 6 and 14 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Christopher D. Prone whose telephone number is (571) 272-6085. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday Through Fri 8:30 to 5:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Corrine McDermott can be reached on (571) 272-4754. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.


Art Unit: 3738

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

CDP

CDP

Christopher D Prone
Examiner
Art Unit 3738


CORRINE McDERMOTT
SUPERVISORY EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY